



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IV.—ON CERTAIN CORRUPTIONS IN THE PERSAE OF AESCHYLUS.

145-149.

φροντίδα κεδνὴν καὶ βαθύβουλον
θώμεθα, χρεία δὲ προσήκει,
πῶς ἄρα πράσσει Ξέρξης βασιλεὺς
Δαρειογενὴς, τὸ πατρωνύμιον
γένος ἡμέτερον.

When the words *γένος ἡμέτερον* are applied to a single person, as they are applied to Xerxes here, they can signify only *our offspring*. They cannot signify, as the scholiast and most commentators would have them, *συγγενὴς ἡμῶν*, *our kinsman* or *our compatriot*: *γένος* has no such meaning. But the offspring of the elders who recite these lines Xerxes was not; and *γένος ἡμέτερον*, accordingly, they cannot call him. Further exception might be taken, were it not superfluous, to the epithet *πατρωνύμιον*, a natural title indeed for the whole people which drew from its forefather Perseus the name of Persian, but devoid of special application to the king and conveying, in his regard, nothing not already conveyed by *Δαρειογενὴς*. In Mr. Paley's translation 'one of our race *which* bears the name of *its* ancestor Perseus' there is involved, even if we condone the rendering of *γένος*, a further fallacy which a glance at my italics will detect. As for Hermann's 'genus a Perseo ductum, unde nos nomen habemus, ideoque nobis cognatum,' it has really little relation to the Greek.

What has happened seems clear. The dipodia τὸ πατρωνύμιον stands one line higher than it was meant to stand, and errs in one letter. The chorus should rightly enquire:

πῶς ἄρα πράσσει Ξέρξης βασιλεὺς
Δαρειογενὴς
γένος ἡμέτερόν τε πατρωνύμιον *

how it fares with Xerxes the king and with our Persian folk. Their care is not for Xerxes alone, but also for the men of whom he has emptied Persia: it is, as they say in vv. 8 sq., ἀμφὶ νόστω τῇ βασιλείῳ καὶ πολυχρόσῳ στρατιᾷς.

162-167.

ταῦτα δὴ λιποῦσ' ἰκάνω χρυσεοστόλους δόμους
καὶ τὸ Δαρεῖον τε καὶ μὲν κοινὸν εὐνατήριον.
καὶ με καρδίαν ἀμύσσει φροντίς· ἐς δ' ὑμᾶς ἐρῶ
μῦθον, οὐδαμῶς ἐμαντῆς οὐσ' ἀδείμαντος, φίλοι,
165
μὴ μέγας πλούτος κοίνισας οὐδας ἀντρέψῃ ποδὶ
ῥαβδον, ὃν Δαρεῖος ἤρεν οὐκ ἄνευ θεῶν τυνος.

I have briefly signified elsewhere my view of v. 165. *ἐμαντῆς*, which is supposed to mean *περὶ ἐμαντῆς*, is in the MS text destructive of sense: we learn as Atossa proceeds that her fear is not for herself, but for her absent son and the fortune of Persia. A corruption is recognized by all recent editors, and Weil, with the approval of Kirchhoff and Wecklein, has conjectured *μῦθον οὐδαμῶς ἐμαντῆς οὐδ' ἀδείμαντον*, referring to Soph. *Ajax* 481 *οὐδεὶς ἐρεῖ ποθ' ὥς ὑπόβλητον λόγον*, | *Αἴας, ἔλεξας, ἀλλὰ τῆς σταντοῦ φρενός*. This gives no suitable meaning, for Atossa's speech is assuredly not *ὑπόβλητος*, nor, so far as I can discern, in any sense *οὐχ ἐαντῆς*; but that so unsatisfactory a conjecture should have been made and approved is all the more striking a testimony to the strength of feeling against the MS text. I have proposed to write:

ἐς δ' ὑμᾶς ἐρῶ [sc. τὴν φροντίδα],
θ υ μ ὶ ν οὐδαμῶς ἐμαντῆς οὐσ' ἀδείμαντος κτλ.

ἐμαντῆς then depending on *θυμόν*. To cite only the most apposite examples of a widespread error, the Medicean MS gives *μυθοῦσθαι* for *θυμοῦσθαι* in Ag. 1367 and *θυμῷ* for *μύθῳ* in Soph. *Ant.* 718.

But my purpose in reverting to the passage is to champion a neglected emendation of Rauchenstein's in v. 166. *πλούτος* cannot *κοίνισαι* nor can it *ἀντρέψαι ποδί*, and is now generally given up for corrupt. The correction which to me appears uniquely apt is Rauchenstein's *στρατός*. The change is really a slight one: *στ* and *π* are much confused in cursives and minuscules, *ρ* and *λ* in all MSS of all ages, *α* and *ον* with especial frequency in the text of Aeschylus. Only by reading *στρατός* will you elicit any just sense from *κοίνισας οὐδας*: Atossa fears lest the flight of the great army covering the face of the earth with dust should overthrow the fortune which Darius, God helping him, built up. Homer in Ξ 145, speaking of an army, uses *εὐρὺ κοίνουσιν πεδίον* as an ornamental equivalent for *φεύγονται*, and has *κονίοντες πεδίοιο*, of horses and chariots, more than once; Aeschylus in Sept. 60, the only other

place where he employs the verb, has *στρατὸς χωρεῖ, κονίει*, and delights in the association of *κόνις* and *στρατός*: Suppl. 186 *ὄρῳ κόνιν, ἀναυδον ἄγγελον στρατοῦ*, Sept. 79 *μεθεῖται στρατὸς στρατόπεδον λιπῶν* . . . *αἰθερία κόνις με πείθει φανείσα*, probably Ag. 500. Let it not be thought that this reading would require *ποσὶν* for *ποδί*: the singular *πόδα* is similarly used of a multitude in Suppl. 31. It is quite possible that Aeschylus wrote *ἀντρέψη πέδοι*, but I only mention this lest any one else should make the same guess and fall in love with it.

271-280.

ΧΟ. ὄτοτοτοῖ, μάταν	str.
τὰ πολέα βέλεα παμμιγῇ	
γὰς ἀπ' Ἀσίδος ἦλθ' ἐπ' αἶαν	
δᾶαν, Ἑλλάδα χάραν.	
ΑΓ. πλήθουσι νεκρῶν δυσπότημος ἐφθαρμένων	275
Σαλαμίνος ἅκται πᾶς τε πρόσχωρος τόπος.	
ΧΟ. ὄτοτοτοῖ, φίλων	ant.
ἀλίδονα μέλεα παμβαφῇ	
κατθανόντα λέγεις φέρεσθαι	
πλαγκτοῖς ἐν διπλάκισσιν.	280

All that I here propose to myself is to finish the correction of two errors already emended in the main. In vv. 273 sq. the apposition *αἶαν, χάραν* is, to be sure, Greek, but not the Greek of a good writer. The function of apposition is to add something to the sense, and we therefore do not place in apposition two words which, like *αἶα* and *χώρα*, are synonyms. Weil has restored the diction of Aeschylus by what will be found on examination an easy change, *τᾶσδ' ἀπ' Ἀσίδος ἦλθεν αἶας δᾶαν Ἑλλάδα χάραν*, and this is approved by Oberdick and Wecklein. But the illustrious critic and his followers have overlooked the fact that *αἶα* is not employed by the tragic writers except in places where the metre refuses *γαῖα*, and that therefore tragedy may be ransacked in vain for such a phenomenon as *αἶας* preceded by an ephelcystic *ν*. No: just as Aeschylus writes Pers. 390 *κατέσχε γαῖαν* not *κατέσχευ αἶαν*, 502 *λιταῖσι γαῖαν* not *λιταῖσιν αἶαν*, Suppl. 272 *ἀνῆκε γαῖα* not *ἀνῆκεν αἶα*, 1039 *χεύμασι γαίας* not *χεύμασιν αἶας*, so he must here have written not *ἦλθεν αἶας* but *ἦλθε γαίας*. And this will perhaps be even nearer to the MS, for the resemblance between *γ* and *π* in capitals and uncials often amounts almost to identity.

In v. 280 we are at once arrested by the question: why *πλαγκτοῖς* instead of *πλαγκταῖς*? There is here no such metrical excuse as

may be pleaded for *πλαγκτὸς οὔσα* in Ag. 598. Further, it is felt on all hands that *in vagrant cloaks* is an absurd expression, and indeed that in this rapid summary of disaster such a detail as *διπλάκεσσιν* is itself somewhat trivial and beside the mark. Hence the rash invent unheard-of meanings for *δίπλαξ*; the prudent have recourse to conjecture. Hartung proposes *σπιλάδεσσιν*, which I think right and hope to establish; but plainly the passage is not emended yet. *πλαγκτοῖς* is now less defensible than ever; to get rid of it, Hartung ruins the metre by writing *πλάγκτ'*, and is thus driven to more violence in the strophe; Weil suggests *πλαγκτῶν*, an improbable alteration; Wecklein *πλαγκτούς*, an improbable construction. And not only is further change thus involved, but it is also far from clear how *σπιλάδεσσιν* became *διπλάκεσσιν*.

If however Aeschylus wrote *πλάγκτ' ἐνὶ σπιλάδεσσιν* all is explained as the result of *πλαγκτένκπιλαδεσσιν*. By a frequent error *κ* was written for *ισ*; the correction, added above the line or in the margin, was mistaken, through the perpetual confusion of *ι* with *οι*, for a correction of *πλάγκτ'* to *πλαγκτοῖς*; and out of the monstrous *κπιλάδεσσιν* the Greek word *διπλάκεσσιν* inevitably emerged, for *κπιλαδ* and *διπλακ* are different arrangements of the same six letters. It says nothing against this correction that a trochee in the antistrophe thus answers a spondee in the strophe, since Aeschylus habitually admits such correspondence in glyconic bases: those scholars who retain *δῖαν* in v. 274 may even prefer a trochee in v. 280, but I myself find *δᾶαν* a necessary alteration. Let me add, in favor of *ἐνί*, that the epic form has a peculiar fitness as recalling the *ποτὶ σπιλάδεσσιν* of Homer; and, in favor of the entire emendation, that the words *μέλεια λέγεις φέρεσθαι ἐνὶ σπιλάδεσσιν* truthfully represent the *πλῖθουσι νεκρῶν ἀκταί* of the messenger, while the MS reading puts into his mouth what he never said.

293-295.

σιγῶ πάλαι δύστηνος ἐκπεπληγμένη
κακοῖς ὅπερ βάλλει γὰρ ἦδε συμφορὰ,
τὸ μήτε λέξαι μήτ' ἐρωτῆσαι πάθη.

It appears impossible that v. 295 should mean *τὸ μήτε σε λέξαι πάθη μήτε ἐμὲ ἐρωτῆσαι αὐτά*: besides, grant it possible, the statement is untrue: the messenger has already given, between the ejaculations of the chorus, a terse and comprehensive summary of the *πάθη* in question. It remains then to take *λέξαι* apart from *πάθη*,

with Atossa for its subject, in the sense of *φθέγγασθαι*. But this again is impossible, for *λέγω* is not so used: *μηδὲν λέξαι* would be required. The difficulty seems to have been first apprehended by Wecklein, who proposes *φωνεῖν*: this word may have been expelled by a superscript gloss *λέγειν*, and *λέγειν* may then have been altered for metre's sake to *λέξαι*. There is a far simpler way: nothing more, I believe, is needed to restore the passage than the addition of a single letter:

τὸ μήτ' ἐλέγξαι μήτ' ἐρωτῆσαι πάθη.

ἐλέγξαι and *ἐρωτῆσαι* are almost synonyms; but this virtual tautology is of a kind rather sought after than shunned by the tragic style: closely parallel is Soph. O. T. 1305 *πόλλ' ἀνερέσθαι, πολλὰ πυθέσθαι*.

453-456.

ἐνταῦθα πέμπει τοῦσδ', ὅπως, ὅτ' ἐκ νεῶν
φθαρέντες ἐχθροὶ νῆσον ἐκσφάζοιτο,
κτείνουεν εὐχέιρωτον Ἑλλήνων στρατὸν,
φίλους δ' ὑπεκσφάζουεν ἐναλίων πόρων.

In this, the vulgate text, the word *ἐκσφάζοιτο* might not itself arouse suspicion. But suspicion is aroused when only two lines below we come to *ὑπεκσφάζουεν*; aroused not by the mere repetition, for the Greeks are less careful than the Romans and the moderns to avoid this fault, but by the following considerations. When *ἐκσφάζω* and *ὑπεκσφάζω* occur with this brief interval, the element *-σφάζω* ought to mean the same thing in each verb, and the elements *ὑπεκ-* ought to mean something more than the element *ἐκ-*. But the reverse is the fact. There is no tangible difference, as there ought to be, between *ἐκ-* in v. 454 and *ὑπεκ-* in v. 456: there is a tangible difference, as there ought not to be, between *σφάζω* in v. 454, which signifies merely *bring to land* (to meet death), and *σφάζω* in v. 456, which signifies *save alive*. And suspicion mounts to something like certainty when we turn to the apparatus criticus and find that the MS reading is not *ἐκσφάζοιτο* but *ἐξσωζοίτο*, with *κ* written overhead as a correction. The question then is not whether we will stick to the MS or desert it; no one dreams of sticking to it: the question is whether we will take the conjecture of a Byzantine scribe, which imports some difficulty, or the conjecture of a modern critic with the resources of science at his disposal. M. Stahl has pro-

posed *ἐξοισοίατο*, an amendment suggested, I presume, by Herod. VIII 76 ὥς, ἐπεὶ γένηται ναυμαχίη, ἐνθαῦτα μάλιστα ἐξοισομένῳ τῶν τε ἀνδρῶν καὶ τῶν ναυηγίων. But the future optative appears to be inexcusable; there is here no *oratio obliqua*. We shall approach the MS even more closely if we restore the word which the lexicons will show to be the most natural of all words for the occasion: *ἐξωθοίατο*.

668-671.

ὅπως καινά τε κλήης
νέα τ' ἄχῃ
δέσποτα δεσπότου
φύνηθι.

Dindorf's *δεσποτᾶν* for *δεσπότου* in v. 670 seems to me probably right; but my present concern is with v. 668. The answering verse in the strophe is *βαλὴν, ἀρχαῖος βαλήν*: when we compare the two it appears that the scansion must be $\cup - \cup - \cup - \cup$. To shorten the penultimate *αι* of *ἀρχαῖος*, as of *πετρίος*, *παλαιός*, *γεραῖός*, *δίκαιος* and *δελταῖος* in tragedy, *ἔμπαιος* in Homer and *ληθαῖος* in Anacreon, is quite permissible. But it is not equally legitimate to lengthen *τε* before *κλ* in v. 668; and a long syllable is therefore required in its stead. This should seemingly be restored by the almost imperceptible change *καινά γᾶ* for *καινά τε*. The confusion of *γαῖ* and *τε* needs no explaining; but I will adduce another example of the same error, which I detect in Eum. 803. The MS there gives

ὕμεις δέ τε τῇδε γῇ βαρὺν κότον
σκήψητε.

The verse has no metre, and its meaning is precisely the opposite of the meaning demanded. I suppose that Aeschylus wrote

ὕμεις δέ γαῖα τῇδε μὴ βαρὺν κότον
σκήψητε.

γαῖαι, by the omission of one *αι*, became *γαῖ*; this surprising Doricism naturally evoked a marginal correction *γῇ*, which however missed its mark and was substituted not for *γᾶ* but for *μῇ*; then *γᾶ* was further corrupted, as in Pers. 658, to *τε*.

815-817.

τοιγὰρ κακῶς δράσαντες οὐκ ἐλάσσονα
πάσχουσι, τὰ δὲ μέλλουσι, κοῦδέπω κακῶν
κρηπὶς ὕπεσται, ἀλλ' ἔτ' ἐκπιδύεται.

I take for a starting point Schuetz's ἐκπιδύεται, believing it to be the first stride, and that a great one, towards the restoration of the passage. True, it is to insult Aeschylus to suppose him the author of such a sentence as results from this correction, if correction here stops short. But every impeachment which can be brought against ἐκπιδύεται is equally an impeachment of the MS reading ἐκπαιδεύεται, which apparently therefore is recommended to its defenders merely by its intrinsic absurdity: neither κακὰ ἐκπαιδεύεται nor κρηπὶς ἐκπαιδεύεται has any vestige of a meaning. Against the emended line there lie two objections of great though unequal gravity. To take the lighter first, the clash of metaphor in κρηπὶς and ἐκπιδύεται is hardly credible: the laying of a foundation and the welling forth of a spring are two images which refuse to be made one. Still, the Greeks were less sensitive to such incongruity than we are, and though I think no real parallel can be adduced, it might yet be possible to find examples only less harsh than this.

But there remains a far heavier, a fatal objection. It is entirely permissible to say, with impressive exaggeration, οὐδέπω κακῶν κρηπὶς ὕπαστιν, that is, *calamity is as yet not even begun*. Precisely thus does Prometheus say in P. V. 767 οὐς γὰρ νῦν ἀκήκοας λόγους | εἶναι δόκει σοι μηδέπω'ν προσιμίοις. But, having said so much, there you must stop: you cannot proceed to say ἀλλ' ἔτ' ἐκπιδύεται, *but it is still going on*. Begin by saying that a thing is not yet *finished*, then you may proceed to say, with such pleonasm as poets love, that it is still going on: οὐδέπω κακῶν | ἔπεστι θριγκὸς, ἀλλ' ἔτ' ἐκπιδύεται, for instance, would be the writing, not indeed of a decent stylist, but still the writing of a sane man. But to say that a thing *is not yet begun but is still going on* is such nonsense as not one of us can conceive himself uttering in the loosest negligence of conversation; only when centuries of transcription by barbarians have imputed it to an incomparable poet, then we accept it as a matter of course.

I will ask the reader not to take fright at what may strike the first glance as a violent change; it is not really such.

κοὔδέπω κακῶν
κρηπὶς ἀπέσβηκ', ἀλλ' ἔτ' ἐκπιδύεται.

ν and π are commonly confused in uncials, and even if they were not, two words like κρηνὶς and κρηπὶς, which coincide in five of their letters and differ only in one, are always easily interchanged. Why, in the verb σβέννυμι, β should tend to become τ, I cannot

tell; but the fact is so: thus in Eur. Med. 1218 ἀπέσβη has been corrupted to ἀπέστη, in Aesch. Ag. 879 κατεσβήκασιν to καθεστήκασιν. But now ἀπέστηκ' and ὕπεστιν are palaeographically almost the same thing: ἀπ- and ὑπ- are confused 'dici non potest quotiens,' says Bast; η and ι were for ages identical in sound; κ and ν in uncial MSS nearly identical in shape. For the metaphor see v. 745
 κ α κ ω ν ἔοικε π η γ ἡ πᾶσιν ἡρῆσθαι φίλοις.

847-853.

ὦ δαίμον, ὧς με πόλλ' ἐσέρχεται κακὰ
 ἄλγη, μάλιστα δ' ἥδε συμφορὰ δάκνει
 ἀτιμίαν γε παιδὸς ἀμφὶ σώματι
 ἐσθημάτων κλύουσιν, ἥ νιν ἀμπέχει. 850
 ἀλλ' εἰμι, καὶ λαβοῦσα κόσμον ἐκ δόμων
 ὑπαντιάζειν ἐμῷ παιδί πειράσομαι
 οὐ γὰρ τὰ φίλτατ' ἐν κακοῖς προδώσομεν.

The earliest attempt to mend the metre of v. 852 is the transposition παιδ' ἐμῷ in the inferior MSS. This elision was of course impossible to Aeschylus, and the assumed corruption is inexplicable: few scribes would find παιδ' ἐμῷ a difficulty, no scribe would find ἐμῷ παιδί an improvement. The same objection holds against Burges' παιδί μου and Lobeck's παῖδ' ἐμόν, which depart yet further from the MS: Lobeck's conjecture is moreover discountenanced by the ὑπαντιάζει παιδί of v. 836. Other proposals are even less plausible.

It seems to have been generally assumed that the words ἐμῷ παιδί, though themselves corrupt, nevertheless represent correctly the sense of the lost words or word. But there is no reason to think so, for παιδί is readily supplied from what precedes: the dative is in like manner omitted after this verb in v. 410 Περσίδος γλώσσης ῥόθος ὑπαντιάζει. Disembarrassed of this preconception I think we shall restore the verse without much ado:

ὑπαντιάζειν ἐμποδὼν πειράσομαι

I will essay to meet him on his way. The descent from ἐμποδὼν through ἐμπέδωι to ἐμπαίδωι consisted of the easiest stages: thence the shortest way to Greek was the transposition of one letter, ἐμῷ παιδί, which may well have stood in some ancestor of our MS, for one school of copyists writes ἐμῷ where another writes ἐμῶι and where we write ἐμῷ.

It will illustrate one stage in this corruption if I here emend Eur. I. T. 755-8 :

ἐξαίρετόν μοι δὸς τόδ', ἦν τι ναῦς πάθη
 χῆ δέλτος ἐν κλύδωνι χρημάτων μέτα
 ἀφανὴς γένηται, σῶμα δ' ἐκσώσω μόνον,
 τὸν ὄρκον εἶναι τόνδε μηκέτ' ἔμπεδον.

Pylades and Iphigenia have interchanged oaths, she that she will send him safely away, he that he will carry her letter to her brother. But then it strikes him that he may lose the letter through shipwreck and be therefore unable to fulfil his oath ; so he desires to make the exception that in those circumstances it shall no longer be binding. But this is not the meaning of the words τὸν ὄρκον εἶναι τόνδε μηκέτ' ἔμπεδον. What ἔμπεδος ὄρκος means we perfectly well know from v. 790 τὸν δ' ὄρκον ὃν κατώμοσ' ἐμπεδώσομεν, *we will perform the oath which I swear*, and from many another passage where the phrase recurs: ἔμπεδος ὄρκος means an oath which is performed. Now Pylades cannot without absurdity beg of Iphigenia that if the letter is lost his oath shall not be *performed*: that is *ex hypothesi* certain. What he must ask is that his oath shall not be *considered incumbent on him to perform*, that he shall be held guiltless though he does not perform it. And this in Greek will be :

τὸν ὄρκον εἶναι τόνδε μηκέτ' ἐμποδών.

See Aesch. P. V. 13 σφῶν μὲν ἐντολὴ Διὸς | ἔχει τέλος δὴ κοῦδ' ἐν ἐμποδὼν ἔτι.

LONDON, *March*, 1888.

A. E. HOUSMAN.